ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ ಹೆಗ್ಗಡೆ.—ಇದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್.—ಯಾವಾಗ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಯೋಚಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ?

ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ ಹೆಗ್ಗಡೆ.—ಯಾವಾಗ ಜಾಗ ಸಿಗುತ್ತೋ ಮತ್ತು ಯಾವಾಗ ಹಣ ಸಿಗುತ್ತೊ ಆಗ ಸ್ಥಳಾಂತರಿಸಿರಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Question Hour is over.

SPEAKER'S RULING *Re.* SUPPLEMENTARIES TO BE PUT TO QUESTIONS.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE (Sankeswar).—Hon'ble Member Sri Azeez Sait has raised a point of order under Rule 44 (2). While considering the operation of the rule the other rule, *i.e.*, No. 32 has also to be taken into account. The first hour of the Assembly shall be available for answering questions. So the limitation of one hour is there. The Sub-rule (2) under Rule 44 provides that any member may put a Supplementary question for the purpose of further elucidating any matter. These rules have to be interpreted in a harmonious way. Of-course Sub-rule (2) of 44th rule provides for putting questions by any member. But under rule 32, there is some limitation and these things must be completed within the scope of one hour. What I submit is that if the Speaker or any person in the Chair comes to a conclusion that the question is sufficiently discussed and further supplementaris may not be asked, it is for the House to utilise that one hour to the best advantage to cover all the questions and to see that no question is unanswered. Under the rule any member may ask any supplementary question arising out of the main question. These fundamentals are there. But in practice it is not possible of the time limitation under rule 32. This aspect may kindly be taken into account before giving ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member Sri Kothavale has explained the operation of the two rules read together, namely Rule 44 and the other rule which provides for the period of one hour being devoted for questions. The point with regard to putting of supplementaries does not arise for the first time today. The position is clear beyond any shadow of doubt. When questions themselves are admitted, the Members have got a right to put the question. But that does not mean any question and every question will come before the House. When any answer is given, supplementaries are allowed. Supplementaries are for the purpose of clarifications arising out of the answers given. Rule 44 does not say about the number of supplementaries to be allowed. It says that a Member may put a supplementary. But the Hon'ble Member Mr. Aziz Sait should not forget that he cannot put a supplementary until I have called upon him. His desire is not the crucial point. His desire aided and served by the Speaker giving him assistance by calling upon him to put the supplementary, makes his right operative. Nor is

it said anywhere about the number of supplementaries to be allowed. It is well-known that the number of supplementaries is not endless. That is why everyday and even today I said that in view of the large number of quetions that have to be included and that have been included in the list, too many supplementaries are not possible, which again goes to show that the discretion rests with the Speaker. But the discretion of the Speaker cannot be capriciously exercised. He has to take a view of the entire situation. As was rightly pointed out by Mr. Kothavale, the interest of every member has to be safeguarded to the maximum extent possible. That is why I venture to tell the Members when they put a number of supplementaries on the matter of agreement relating to Cauvery waters, that it has been the subject of comment, debate and discussion profusely as can be seen from the proceedings. So, I thought other members who might have particular information that might be elicited during question hour might better utilise the time. But the opinion of the Members prevailed and I did not run counter to it.

Mr. Azeez Sait said that Members have got a right. I have never disputed that right. How it is to be exercised, when it is to be exercised and to what extent it is to be exercised is the primary point for consideration. I would have allowed Mr. Azeez Sait if I had known that such an important supplementary was in his mind. How am I to know that? Therefore, certain lines have to be drawn. As could be seen, questions are given notice of by more than one Member. The principles to guide the Speaker in exercise of his discretion have been well-formulated. It is even known that in Lok Sabha, 8 to 10 members together give notice of one question and the rule that is observed there is supplementaries are allowed to the first person; if he is not there, to the second or to the third, but not to the entire set of persons who have given notice. If that is so, members who have not joined in giving notice should be given time, may be given time certainly if it is available, but if it is not available, I do not think they can make it a grievance, much less raise it as a point of order. There is no breach of any rule. Therefore, evidently, Mr. Aziz Sait felt a little hurt in not getting an opportunity. But Mr. Aziz Sait might kindly remember that Mr. Krishnan also wanted a chance to put a supplementary after Mr. Shamanna put two or three supplementaries. But it was not given and he might have thought there might be some denial of right. Denial there is, but does it give cause or occasion for legitimate grievence? That is the point. What happens is, several members get up and when they are not able to get a chance to speak on every demand or every Bill or every clause, we have to draw a line and we have to face realities as they are.

Therefore, I do not think there is much substance in the point raised. But I do want that Members should discuss among themselves or with the leaders or with the whips and kindly inform me how many questions I should include in the list. I am not anxious to have a large number of questions. But if Members feel that 40 or 10 or 5 should be included in the list, I cannot help it.

(MR. SPEAKER)

Then remains only one point raised by Sri Nagappa of Raichur who said that the rule provides from 20—30 questions. Members will kindly remember the succeeding part of the rule. It is the Speaker who has to determine. But I do not determine it by myself by my absolute will or even whimsically. I ask the House. If there is any grievance entertained by Mr. Nagappa, it must be against the House. It cannot be against the Chair. He can appeal to the House and say please do not do it. But whatever it is, there is no point of order.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಎನ್. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಪತಿ.—ಈ 40 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೂ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಒಂದೂವರೆ ನಿಮಿಷವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ತಯಾರಾಗಿವೆ, ಬರುತ್ತವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ, ಈಗ ತಾವು ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ತೃಪ್ತಿಯಾಗಬೇಕೇ ? ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ 30ನೇ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು .—ಯಾರು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ತೃಪ್ತಿಪಡಿಸುವುದು ? 40 ಪಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಹಾಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ಸಾಕು ಎಂದು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಹೇಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಎನ್. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಪತಿ.—40 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಪಟ್ಟಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಿ ತೃಪ್ತಿಪಡುವಾಗ Commonsense tells us that it requires for a Member to stand up and put the question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This member is doubting the commonsense of the House ?

Sri R. N. LAKSHMIPATHI.—What is going to happen to this 30th List, I want to know. Will you please take it up tomorrow at least ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಜೀಜ್ ಸೇಟ್.—ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ನಾನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ತಾವು ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ನನಗೆ ಬೇಜಾರು ಆಯಿತು. ತಾವು ಲಾಯರ್. ನಾನು ಲಾ ನೋಡಿಲ್ಲ. Sir, the Chair was pleased to say that there is no point of order. I want to draw your kind attention to the limit or the restriction that the Speaker can impose.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member is raising a wonderful point.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—Mr. Kothavale has spoiled a good case by bad advocacy. I just want to bring to your notice one point. Please refer to rule 44 (4) :

> " The Speaker shall disallow any supplementary question if, in his opinion, it infringes the rules as to the subject matter of questions".

You can reject my supplementary. But as far as putting the supplementary, I want to draw your kind attention to 44 (2) :

> "After a question has been answered, any member may put a supplementary question for the purpose of further elucidating any matter regarding which an answer has been given."

Putting a supplementary is a discretion vested in me. It does not say "Shall"; that means, I have a right. Now please refer to rule 32.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is ultimately said is, that the members have a right to put unlimited supplementaries.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—No, definitely not sir, I would draw your attention to one instance. There was a reply to the supplementary question on Hubli-Dharwar Corporation, in which the Hon. Minister for Municipal Administration said that it was incompetent. When every Corporation, Municipality, and Local Body, elected by the public is declared as incompetent and if that is the opinion of the hon. Minister, don't you think there will be supplementaries on that reply. We are in a democracy ; we talk of decentralisation of power ; we are in a Welfare State and in Democracy and everyone wants decentralisation of power. Naturally supplementaries are bound to arise on that question and reply of the hon. Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have heard the member enough on the Point of Order.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Under Rule 38, the Speaker has to decide whether a question or a part thereof is or is not admissible. He has to decide the admissibility of a question and the Government has to furnish the reply within 15 days from the date of its receipt by the Government. If the Government feels that there will be delay beyond those 15 days, they have to request the Speaker to fix another day for answering it, but the subsequent date for answering it shall not be not later than 30 days from the date of its receipt by the Government. In the case of Question No. 310 the Question is admitted on 12th April 1967 and the reply submitted to the Speaker on 7th July 1967 as can be seen from the 29th List of today's agenda. The hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs says in the answer, that the nature of the question does not admit of furnishing an immediate reply, etc. This is short-cutting the responsibility of answering the question. It is also, a clear violation of the relevant rules.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will give a ruling to-morrow.

Sri P. VENKATAGIRIYAPPA.—I have sent two Short-Notice Questions two weeks ago. Nothing is heard of them. I want to know whether there is any time limit for admitting Short Notice Questions. Or will the Question of one particular Member be admitted and that of the other not admitted? What is the procedure? What has happened to the questions ? At least that may be intimated.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not here. He must ascertain from the Office and must certainly not make me tell him what the rules are, disturbing the other work. Now, Short Notice Question No. 109 may be taken up.

———